

1 SHEPPARD MULLIN RICHTER & HAMPTON LLP
2 A Limited Liability Partnership
3 Including Professional Corporations
4 GARY L. HALLING, Cal. Bar No. 66087
5 JAMES L. McGINNIS, Cal. Bar No. 95788
6 MICHAEL W. SCARBOROUGH, Cal. Bar No. 203524
7 DYLAN I. BALLARD, Cal. Bar No. 253929
8 Four Embarcadero Center, 17th Floor
9 San Francisco, California 94111-4106
10 Telephone: 415-434-9100
11 Facsimile: 415-434-3947
12 E-mail: ghalling@sheppardmullin.com
13 jmcginnis@sheppardmullin.com
14 mscarborough@sheppardmullin.com
15 dballard@sheppardmullin.com

9 Attorneys for Defendants
10 SAMSUNG SDI AMERICA, INC.,
11 SAMSUNG SDI CO., LTD.,
12 SAMSUNG SDI (MALAYSIA) SDN. BHD.,
SAMSUNG SDI MEXICO S.A. DE C.V.,
SAMSUNG SDI BRASIL LTDA.,
SHENZHEN SAMSUNG SDI CO., LTD. and
TIANJIN SAMSUNG SDI CO., LTD.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

19 | In re: CATHODE RAY TUBE (CRT)
ANTITRUST LITIGATION

Case No. 07-5944 SC

MDL No. 1917

21 This Document Relates to:
22 ALL DIRECT PURCHASER ACTIONS

**DECLARATION OF MICHAEL W.
SCARBOROUGH IN SUPPORT OF SDI
DEFENDANTS' OPPOSITION TO (1)
SHARP'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO
FILE MOTION FOR
RECONSIDERATION OF MOTION TO
ENLARGE SHARP'S TIME TO OPT
OUT; (2) SHARP'S MOTION FOR
EXTENSION OF TIME TO OBJECT TO
SETTLEMENTS WITH DIRECT
PURCHASER PLAINTIFFS; AND (3)
SHARP'S OBJECTIONS TO
SETTLEMENTS WITH DIRECT
PURCHASER PLAINTIFFS**

I, MICHAEL W. SCARBOROUGH, hereby declare:

2 1. I am an attorney licensed to practice law in the State of California and in the United
3 States District Court for the Northern District of California. I am a partner with the firm of
4 Sheppard, Mullin, Richter and Hampton LLP, counsel of record for defendants Samsung SDI
5 America, Inc., Samsung SDI Co., Ltd., Samsung SDI (Malaysia) Sdn. Bhd., Samsung SDI Mexico
6 S.A. de C.V., Samsung SDI Brasil Ltda., Shenzen Samsung SDI Co., Ltd., and Tianjin Samsung
7 SDI Co., Ltd. (collectively "SDI") in this matter. I make this declaration in support of SDI's
8 opposition to (1) Sharp's Motion for Leave to File Motion for Reconsideration of Court's Order
9 Denying Sharp's Motion to Enlarge Time to Opt Out (Dkt. No. 2750); (2) Sharp's Motion For
10 Extension of Time to Object To Direct Purchaser Plaintiff Settlements (Dkt. No. 2751); and
11 (3) Sharp's Objections to SDI's Settlement with the Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs (Dkt. No. 2751-2).

12 2. As outside counsel for SDI, I was involved in the negotiation of SDI's settlement
13 with the Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs in this litigation (the "settlement"). The settlement was the
14 result of extensive negotiations, during which the parties expressed widely divergent views on
15 almost every issue in the case—including which sales and customers were properly at issue, and
16 the appropriate volume of commerce, overcharge, and damages assumptions.

17 3. The parties did not come to a resolution or compromise with respect to these
18 disputes, and there was no mathematical formula, or list of agreed-upon sales or customers, used
19 for arriving at the final settlement figure. Instead, the final terms of the settlement were the direct
20 result of extensive compromise and a Mediator's proposal that made no attempt to articulate which
21 customers or sales were or were not reflected in the settlement.

22 4. During negotiations, counsel for the Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs took the position
23 that the potentially relevant volume of commerce included tens of billions of dollars in CRT tube
24 and finished product purchases.

25 5. SDI was aware of the differing legal issues that may confront direct and indirect
26 purchasers and negotiated its settlement with the Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs accordingly.

1 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the
2 foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

3

4 DATED: August 21, 2014

5

6

7 By

/s/ Michael W. Scarborough

8 MICHAEL W. SCARBOROUGH

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28